

REMARKS

Claims 2 and 7 are amended herein. Claims in the instant case are Claims 1-16.

Claim Objections

Claims 2 and 7 are objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended Claims 2 and 7 hereinto correct the informalities to overcome the cited objections.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-7 and 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “BLUETOOTH – The universal radio interface for ad hoc, wireless connectivity” Ericsson Review No. 3, 1998, by Haartsen (Haartsen) in view of U.S. Patent 6,421,716 by Eldridge et al. (Eldridge). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-7 and 9-15 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Haartsen in view of Eldridge, and that the present claimed invention is therefore patentable over Haartsen in view of Eldridge.

Claim 1 recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a:

“A wireless communication method for selective transmission of data among a group of mobile computing devices, comprising:

a) broadcasting a query to determine a group of mobile computing devices within communications range;

b) presenting a list of mobile computing devices determined in step a) to a user on an interface

c) selecting at least one of the mobile computing devices from the list from step b) for a data transfer, the selecting performed by a user;

.....and

e) presenting a confirmation of the data transfer to the user.” (Emphasis added)

Independent Claim 9 recites similar limitations. Claims 2-8 that depend from independent Claim 1 and Claims 10-16 that depend from independent Claim 9 provide further recitations of the features of the present invention.

Haartsen in combination with Eldridge does not show or suggest the claimed limitation of “determining a group of mobile computing devices within communications range; presenting a list of (the determined mobile computing devices) to a user on an interface;.... and ... selecting at least one of the mobile computing devices from the list ... for a data transfer.” Although Haartsen teaches broadcasting a query to determine a group of mobile computing devices within communications range, nowhere does Haartsen disclose presenting a list of mobile computing devices in communications range such that one can be selected by a user. Neither does Haartsen disclose presenting confirmation of data transfer.


Although Eldridge may purport to teach “presenting a user a list of mobile computing devices”, Eldridge only teaches presenting a hierarchical list of specific, established available services for transmitting documentation available on specific wire-based networks over established mobile devices that have been programmed to receive, transmit and store document tokens. In other words, Eldridge discloses an interface that is for specific document transfers wherein the mobile devices have been previously identified, hierarchically prioritized and programmed for the specific purpose of transmitting documentation that is available on a wire-based network. This clearly teaches away from the present invention in which any of a variety of mobile computing devices, existing within communications range, are queried ad hoc at the time a data transfer is desired. The devices are then identified and a list is compiled and made available to an interface via which a user then can select a desired device for performing a data transfer. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that these references fail to teach or suggest embodiments recited in Claims 1 and 9.

Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haartsen in view of Eldridge and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,128,661 by Flanagan et al. (Flanagan). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the present invention as recited in Claims 8 and 16, which depend from allowable base Claims 1 and 9, respectively, is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Haartsen in view of Eldridge and further in view of Flanagan, and that the present claimed invention is therefore patentable over Haartsen in view of Eldridge and further in view of Flanagan.

Thus Applicants respectfully submit that Haartsen in view of Eldridge and further in view of Flanagan does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 8 and 16 that depend from allowable independent Claims 1 and 9, respectively.

Further, Applicant finds no teaching, suggestion, or motivation expressed in Haartsen, Eldridge or Flanagan, or in any of the cited references, individually or in any combination, to combine or modify their teachings in such a way as to suggest "determining a group of mobile computing devices within communications range; presenting a list of (the determined mobile computing devices) to a user on an interface;.... and ... selecting at least one of the mobile computing devices from the list ... for a data transfer", as recited in Claims 1 and 9 of the present invention.

Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the references cited to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found in either the references themselves or knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. Here, none of the cited references, individually or in any combination, teaches, suggests, or ascribes a motivation to combine their references to produce the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1 and 9. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the references cited do not suggest or render obvious the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1 and 9.



CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully asserted that Claims 1-16, as amended herein, overcome the objections and rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of these Claims is respectfully solicited.

Applicants further point out that no contested Claims remain in the present Application.


Applicants have reviewed the following references which were cited but not relied upon and do not find this reference to show or suggest the present claimed invention: US/6,529,119, US/6,359,711, Arfwedson et al. "Ericsson's Bluetooth modules", Ericsson Review No.4, 1999, pp. 198-205, Myers et al. "Collaboration using multiple PDAs connected to a PC" Proceedings ACM 98 Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work, New York, and Monson, Heidi "Bluetooth technology and implications" from sysopt.com, December 14, 1999.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 6/9/04



John P. Wagner
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060